

professional and administrative roles including planning hearings, producing studies, and generally making the trains run on time.

Nita has worked with a number of JEC members including our distinguished majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, Senator ROTH, Congressman "BUD" BROWN, and many others.

Over the years Nita has impressed all of us with her dedication, creativity, and professionalism.

Nita has worked on the most successful JEC projects from the formation of what would become the Reagan Economic Revolution to the New Republican Renaissance.

Nita Morgan will be sorely missed. But we do wish her nothing but the best in her new position with the Business Leadership Council.

Nita, good luck and godspeed.

#### TIME TO APPOINT OUTSIDE COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to once again appoint an outside counsel, for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has not followed the process as described here in the Rules of Official Conduct.

These rules state that after receiving a complaint, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct then determines whether the complaint, here against the Speaker, merits further inquiry and then it issues a preliminary inquiry. That is found in rule XV.

If so, then a subcommittee is appointed to investigate, under rule XVII, whether there is reason to believe a violation has occurred. Then the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducts a trial-like hearing.

Unfortunately, the resolution for a preliminary inquiry has never been filed. But the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, according to its chairperson, has begun a process that is "flexible" and "a process that its own committee Members can feel good about."

Madam Speaker, ethics should not be flexible because the subject of the investigation is the Speaker. I want all Members and the American people to feel good about this investigation and to restore the faith and confidence in this institution.

Please appoint an outside independent counsel.

#### TIME TO CUT SUGAR SUBSIDIES

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, one thing maybe we can agree on, on a bi-

partisan basis, is the sugar program. In a Congress where we are revising and cutting and reducing welfare, education, farm programs right and left. We are restructuring Medicare and the School Lunch Program. We are going after all commodities: Peanuts, cotton, wheat, the Market Promotion Program. The list is endless.

But, Madam Speaker, what stands alone as the sweetest deal of all? Sugar. And the result: The world price of sugar is 11 cents per ton; the domestic price is 24 cents a ton.

But does it really cost the taxpayers? Not directly, because they have got the USDA in on the thing. Who pays the difference though? Shoppers at the grocery stores, and it costs American consumers \$1.4 billion.

Who is getting rich on it? Plenty of sugar farmers out there. There are 33 farmers involved in the sugar program in Florida alone that receive over a billion dollars in payments. One gets about \$65 million a year.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] have a bill to eliminate the sugar program, and I believe, Madam Speaker, we should bring this debate to the floor of the House for a yes-or-no vote.

#### FULL INQUIRY INTO ETHICS COMPLAINTS IS MERITED

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WARD. Madam Speaker, I want to share some newspaper quotations from the Hartford Courant, the newspaper in Hartford, CT. In an article in Wednesday's edition, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct chairman, NANCY JOHNSON, was asked why she was treating ethics cases this year differently than she, in a 1988 letter, said such cases should be treated.

In 1988, Chairman JOHNSON insisted that the committee conduct a full inquiry into every complaint against then Speaker Jim Wright. Mrs. JOHNSON's explanation in the article is that, and I quote from the article, "This is Newt speaking." In 1988, she said that.

Yes, the very man today who is of a different opinion now than he was then; than he and Committee on Standards of Official Conduct Chair JOHNSON were then.

Madam Speaker, if in 1988 we should have had a full, no-subject-areas-ignored-and-avoided inquiry, then we should today. We should do it the same today as they insisted we do it in 1988.

#### DEMOCRATS REMAIN COMMITTED TO LEVELING IMPULSE

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, since the mid-1800's, Western intellectuals

have been consumed by what is known as the leveling impulse. The leveling impulse is the idea that Government can create a more just society by redistributing wealth. Today, the modern Democrat Party is grounded in the leveling impulse. To Democrats, any talk of a tax decrease is absolutely sinful.

This is why they rail at any attempt by this Republican Congress to give working American families a \$500-per-child tax credit. That is why they scream when reduced capital gains are mentioned. And that is why they fight to preserve every silly Government spending project ever devised.

Madam Speaker, Democrats claim we are raiding Medicare to give tax breaks for the rich. This is beyond ludicrous. Our tax cuts are more than offset by shrinking the bureaucratic government. The real problem here is that Democrats are still convinced that all money belongs to them and that government is a miracle worker.

#### INDEPENDENT COUNSEL NOW FOR COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, with September drawing to a close, troubling ethical questions concerning the process of ethics in this House linger on.

As a recent supreme court justice, I am concerned about the rule of law, about ethical standards, about the precedents of this House. The precedent of this House is that in every significant case since 1979, before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, an independent counsel has been proposed and has been implemented.

The words of the gentlewoman who heads that Committee on Standards of Official Conduct today are that she thinks that naming an outside counsel could get in the way of the committee. And she says, and these are really her words this week, "The letter of the law is not compelling to me. My goal is to have a process that the committee members feel good about."

We do not need to feel good. We need the letter of the law. We need the rule of law.

There is another precedent. It's called the Packwood precedent. Delay, delay, delay, until the people of this country demand action. That is what they need to do about Speaker GINGRICH.

#### AMERICA MUST REJECT REPUBLICAN MEDICARE PLAN

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, after only 1 day of hearings, the Republicans have finally released their plan